United Nations A/C.2/71/SR.27

General Assembly
Seventy-first session

Official Records

Distr.: General
24 January 2017

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 27th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 30 November 2016, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Djani ..... (Indonesia)

Contents

Statement by the Chair

Statement by the Secretary of the Committee

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(b) Follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (*continued*)

Agenda item 22: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(b) Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

16-21122 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

Statement by the Chair

1. **The Chair** drew attention to the fact that the Committee was supposed to have completed its work that day but had been granted an extension for the second time. The Committee would now have until 9 December to take action on 19 draft resolutions still before it; however, only negotiations on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.37 entitled "Quadrennial comprehensive policy review of the operational activities for development of the United Nations system" were expected to go beyond 2 December. Delegations were urged to take all necessary measures, including working beyond business hours, to conclude the Committee's work as agreed.

2. **Mr. Tatiyapermpoon** (Thailand), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group would work hard to meet the deadline, as it was currently quite concerned at the slow progress toward achieving consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.37.

Statement by the Secretary of the Committee

3. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Secretariat had edited cross-cutting language on the Paris Agreement — agreed language that had been the result of balanced consideration by delegations and should not have been altered — in five draft resolutions. The fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.53, the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.21/Rev.1, the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.46, the tenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.45 and the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.47 would therefore be corrected to reflect the agreed language. Those preambular paragraphs would consequently read: "Welcoming the Paris Agreement and its early entry into force, encouraging all the parties to fully implement the Agreement, and parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change that have not yet done so to deposit their instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, where appropriate, as soon as possible".

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.4, A/C.2/71/L.21/Rev.1 and A/C.2/71/L.53)

Draft resolutions on combating sand and dust storms (A/C.2/71/L.4 and A/C.2/71/L.53)

4. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.53, submitted by Mr. Díaz de la Guardia (Spain), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.4.

5. **Mr. Tadesse** (Ethiopia), facilitator, said that in paragraph 7, "international conference" should be changed to "international event".

6. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement in connection with draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.53, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, drew attention to the request contained in paragraph 9 of the draft resolution that the Secretary-General should submit to the General Assembly at its seventy-third session a report on the implementation of the resolution and to include in the provisional agenda of its seventy-second session under the item entitled "Sustainable development", a sub-item entitled "Combating sand and dust storms", unless otherwise agreed. The request would constitute an addition to the documentation workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management of one pre-session document of 8,500 words to be in issued in six languages; that would entail additional requirements in the amount of US $37,600 for documentation services in 2018. The additional resource requirements of US $37,600 that would arise for 2018 under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management, would consequently be included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

7. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.53, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

8. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.4 was withdrawn.*

Draft resolution entitled "Cooperative measures to assess and increase awareness of environmental effects related to waste originating from chemical munitions dumped at sea" (A/C.2/71/L.21/Rev.1)

9. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.21/Rev.1, submitted by Lithuania on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document.

10. **Mr. Díaz de la Guardia** (Spain), facilitator, announced that Albania, Georgia, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine had joined as sponsors of the revised draft resolution.

11. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

12. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia also wished to join the sponsors.

13. **Mr. Babajide** (Observer for the European Union), speaking in explanation of position on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the eighth preambular paragraph referring to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea gave cause for concern. The formulation of that paragraph was not consistent with the agreed language in the annual omnibus resolution on oceans and the law of the sea, which was and should remain the authoritative source of any reference to the Convention in resolutions of the General Assembly, namely "emphasizing the universal and unified character of the Convention, and reaffirming that the Convention sets out the legal framework within which all activities in the oceans and seas must be carried out and is of strategic importance as the basis for national, regional and global action and cooperation in the marine sector, and that its integrity needs to be maintained, as recognized also by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in chapter 17 of Agenda 21."

14. Thus, by establishing the legal framework within which all activities in the oceans and seas must be carried out, the Convention promoted stability of the law and maintenance of international peace and security. The universal character of the Convention was not only evident in its universal language and purpose and the commitment to settle all law of the sea issues on the premise that they were interrelated and needed to be considered as a whole, but primarily in its unprecedented, almost universal participation. Currently, 168 States parties, including the European Union, were bound by its provisions.

15. International jurisprudence had long accepted that its provisions either embodied or reflected customary international law. Joining consensus on the adoption of the draft resolution would not imply agreement with the language used in the eighth preambular paragraph or support for its use in any other resolution in the future.

16. **Mr. Morales López** (Colombia) said that protecting oceans was fundamental to sustainable development and that everyone depended on ocean resources in one way or another because those resources provided food security, generated electricity or mitigated climate change, among other benefits. Colombia attached particular importance to preserving marine ecosystems, which would require close international cooperation. For that reason, it had supported the draft resolution under consideration, which would raise awareness about the problem of chemical munitions dumped at sea.

17. However, the eighth preambular paragraph of the text to be adopted contained a reference to the Convention on the Law of the Sea, to which Colombia was not a State party. Colombia refused to acknowledge the Convention as the only policy framework for maritime activities. The Convention was indeed one of the existing legal frameworks but only for its States parties. His country conducted all maritime activities in strict adherence to the international commitments it had expressly accepted or adopted. Those commitments were set forth in a variety of international and regional instruments to which Colombia was a State party.

18. In that regard, Colombia did not accept the fundamental nature of the Convention on the Law of the Sea referred to in the eighth preambular paragraph, nor did it consider that the Convention was universal or that it constituted a single unified body of law. Colombia wished to express its reservations regarding that paragraph and did not consider itself bound by its contents. That paragraph did not constitute a precedent for the negotiation of the draft resolution before the Committee or any other draft resolution negotiated

during future sessions of the General Assembly or other multilateral negotiation arenas.

19. **Ms. Engelbrecht Schadtler** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation would join the consensus on the adoption of the draft resolution, which dealt with important issues related to sustainable development. However, her country did not support the references to international instruments to which the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was not a party. Those references should not be considered as a change in her country's position. In particular, her country was not a party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. For that reason, the norms mentioned in that instrument, including instruments which could be considered to constitute customary international law, were not binding on her country except insofar as its legislation explicitly recognized them. That Convention should not be the only legal framework that purported to govern activities related to oceans and seas, nor could it be considered a universal instrument.

20. *Resolution A/C.2/71/L.21/Rev.1, as orally corrected by the Secretary of the Committee, was adopted.*

21. **Mr. Erciyes** (Turkey) said that his country had joined the consensus on the draft resolution because it attached importance to the conservation and sustainable use of oceans and the prevention of marine pollution of all kinds. The draft resolution would raise awareness of the environmental effects related to waste originating from chemical munitions dumped at sea. However, his country disassociated itself from references to international instruments to which it was not a party. Those references could not be construed as a change in the legal position of Turkey with regard to such instruments. His country did not consider the reference to the Convention on the Law of the Sea in the annual resolution on oceans and the law of the sea as agreed language. A vote on the resolution should take place every year.

Oral decision on the report of the Secretary-General on the mainstreaming of the three dimensions of sustainable development throughout the United Nations system (A/71/76-E/2016/55) *and the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report by the secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora on the implementation of World Wildlife Day* (A/71/215)

22. **The Chair** proposed that the Committee should take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the mainstreaming of the three dimensions of sustainable development throughout the United Nations system, as contained in document A/71/76-E/2016/55, and the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report by the secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora on the implementation of World Wildlife Day, as contained in document A/71/215.

23. *It was so decided.*

(b) Follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.6 and A/C.2/71/L.46)

Draft resolutions entitled "Towards the sustainable development of the Caribbean Sea for present and future generations" (A/C.2/71/L.6 and A/C.2/71/L.46)

24. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.46, submitted by Mr. Díaz de la Guardia (Spain), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.6.

25. **Ms. Francis** (Bahamas), facilitator, thanked the Secretary of the Committee for the explanation on cross-cutting language on the Paris Agreement reflected in the draft resolution, which could therefore be adopted without delay.

26. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.46 contained no programme budget implications.

27. **Mr. Babajide** (Observer for the European Union), speaking in explanation of position on behalf

of the European Union and its member States, said that the eighth preambular paragraph referring to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (the Convention) gave cause for concern. The formulation of that paragraph was not consistent with the agreed language in the omnibus resolution on oceans and the law of the sea, which was and should remain the authoritative source of any reference to the Convention in resolutions of the General Assembly, namely "emphasizing the universal and unified character of the Convention, and reaffirming that the Convention sets out the legal framework within which all activities in the oceans and seas must be carried out, and is of strategic importance as the basis for national, regional and global action and cooperation in the maritime sector, and that its integrity needs to be maintained, as recognized also by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Chapter 17 of Agenda 21."

28. Thus, by establishing the legal framework within which all activities in the oceans and seas must be carried out, the Convention promoted stability of the law and maintenance of international peace and security. The universal character of the Convention was not only evident in its universal language and purpose and the commitment to settle all law of the sea issues on the premise that they were interrelated and needed to be considered as a whole, but primarily in its unprecedented, almost universal participation. Currently, 168 States parties, including the European Union, were bound by its provisions.

29. International jurisprudence had long accepted that its provisions either embodied or reflected customary international law. Joining consensus on the adoption of the draft resolution would not imply agreement with the language used in the eighth preambular paragraph or support for its use in any other resolution in the future.

30. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.46, as orally corrected by the Secretary of the Committee, was adopted.*

31. **Mr. Erciyes** (Turkey) said that his delegation fully supported the efforts of the Association of Caribbean States to develop and implement regional initiatives to promote sustainable conservation and management of their coastal and marine resources. However, his delegation dissociated itself from the references in the draft resolution to the international instruments to which Turkey was not a party. Accordingly, such references could not be construed as a change in the legal position of his country with regard to those instruments. His delegation also did not consider the wording concerning the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in the resolution on oceans and the law of the sea as agreed language. The draft resolution should have been put to a vote.

32. **Ms. Engelbrecht Schadtler** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the adoption of the draft resolution, which dealt with important issues related to the sustainable development of the Caribbean Sea. It also supported the views expressed by the Group of 77 and China, and initiatives by Caribbean States in particular. However, her country did not support the references to international instruments to which the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was not a party. Those references should not be considered as a change in her country's position. In particular, her country was not a party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. For that reason, the norms mentioned in that instrument, including instruments which could be considered to constitute customary international law, were not binding on her country except insofar as its legislation explicitly recognized them.

33. **Mr. Morales López** (Colombia) said that his country attached great importance to the sustainable development of the Caribbean Sea since it had a coastline on that sea and drew much of its environmental, social, cultural and economic wealth from it. As for other Caribbean countries, the sea was a source of development and prosperity for their peoples. His delegation had supported the draft resolution and joined the consensus.

34. However, the eighth preambular paragraph of the text to be adopted contained a reference to the Convention on the Law of the Sea, to which Colombia was not a State party. Colombia did not acknowledge the Convention as the only policy framework for maritime activities. It was one of the existing legal frameworks, but only for its States parties. His country conducted all maritime activities in strict adherence to the international commitments it had expressly accepted or adopted. Those commitments were set

forth in a variety of international and regional instruments to which Colombia was a State party.

35. In that regard, Colombia did not accept the fundamental nature of the Convention on the Law of the Sea referred to in the eighth preambular paragraph, nor did it consider that the Convention was universal or that it constituted a single unified body of law. Colombia wished to express its reservations regarding that paragraph and did not consider itself bound by its contents. That paragraph did not constitute a precedent for the negotiation of the draft resolution before the Committee or any other draft resolution negotiated during future sessions of the General Assembly or other multilateral negotiation arenas.

36. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.6 was withdrawn.*

Oral decision on the report of the Secretary-General on the sustainable development of the Caribbean Sea for present and future generations (A/71/265), *the addendum to the report of the Secretary-General on the follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States* (A/71/267/Add.1), *and the addendum to the note by the Secretary-General transmitting his comments on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Comprehensive review of United Nations system support for small island developing States: initial findings"* (A/71/324/Add.1)

37. **The Chair** proposed that the Committee should take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the sustainable development of the Caribbean Sea for present and future generations, as contained in document A/71/265, the addendum to the report of the Secretary-General on the follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States, as contained in document A/71/267/Add.1, and the addendum to the note by the Secretary-General transmitting his comments on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Comprehensive review of United Nations system support for small island developing States: initial findings", as contained in document A/71/324/Add.1.

38. *It was so decided.*

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.12/Rev.1)

Draft resolution entitled "International Decade for Action, 'Water for Sustainable Development', 2018-2028" (A/C.2/71/L.12/Rev.1)

39. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.12/Rev.1, submitted by Tajikistan on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document.

40. **Mr. Isomatov** (Tajikistan), facilitator, said that the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should read "Reaffirming the sustainable development goals and targets, including those related to water resources, contained in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development [...]". He expressed his gratitude to the sponsors of the draft resolution for their support, and said that he looked forward to cooperating with all delegations, particularly the members of the Group of Friends of Water, in the preparation and implementation of the International Decade for Action, "Water for Sustainable Development", 2018-2028. The Decade would enhance the progress achieved during the International Decade for Action, "Water for Life", 2005-2015; serve as a platform for coordinated actions to achieve water-related goals and targets, including those contained in the Sustainable Development Goals; and complement social capital generated since the United Nations Water Conference held in Mar del Plata, Argentina in 1977.

41. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

42. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Iceland, Mali and the Russian Federation wished to become sponsors.

43. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.12/Rev.1, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

Agenda item 22: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(b) Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.27 and A/C.2/71/L.47)

Draft resolutions entitled "Follow-up to the Second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries" (A/C.2/71/L.27 and A/C.2/71/L.47)

44. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.47, submitted by Mr. Andambi (Kenya), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.27.

45. **Ms. Chanda** (Zambia), facilitator, said that she wished to point out corrections to the eighth preambular paragraph already made by the Secretariat, and to correct the ninth preambular paragraph, which should read: "Recognizing the specific needs and special circumstances of developing country parties, especially those that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change, as provided for in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change". In view of the fact that the Global Sustainable Transport Conference held in Ashgabat had just concluded, the eleventh preambular paragraph should now read: "Taking note of the Global Sustainable Transport Conference held in Ashgabat from 26 to 27 November 2016".

46. Lastly, the final preambular paragraph should read: "Taking note of the Livingstone Call for Action for the Accelerated Implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action for Landlocked Developing Countries, the communiqué of the Ministerial Meeting of Landlocked Developing Countries adopted in the margins of the Tenth Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organization, the declaration adopted at the Fifth Meeting of Trade Ministers of Landlocked Developing Countries, the communiqué of the Fifteenth Annual Ministerial Meeting of Landlocked Developing Countries, and the ministerial declaration adopted at the High-level Meeting on Sustainable Transport of Landlocked Developing Countries."

47. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.47 contained no programme budget implications.

48. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.47, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

49. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.27 was withdrawn.*

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.

United Nations A/C.2/71/SR.28

General Assembly
Seventy-first session

Official Records

Distr.: General
24 January 2017

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 28th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 8 December 2016, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Djani ..... (Indonesia)

Contents

Statement by the Chair

Agenda item 16: Information and communications technologies for development (*continued*)

Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(a) International trade and development (*continued*)

(b) International financial system and development (*continued*)

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(c) Disaster risk reduction (*continued*)

(f) Convention on Biological Diversity (*continued*)

(g) Report of the United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme (*continued*)

(h) Harmony with Nature (*continued*)

(i) Promotion of new and renewable sources of energy (*continued*)

Agenda item 21: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(b) International migration and development (*continued*)

Agenda item 22: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(a) Follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*)

Agenda item 23: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(b) Industrial development cooperation (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

16-20800 (E)

Please recycle

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(c) Disaster risk reduction (*continued*)

(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind (*continued*)

Agenda item 24: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(b) South-South cooperation for development (*continued*)

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (*continued*)

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

Statement by the Chair

1. **The Chair**, commending Committee members for their exceptional hard work and dedication thus far, urged maximum flexibility in negotiations on the draft resolution on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development, which he hoped could be concluded that evening and circulated under the no-objection procedure.

2. **Mr. Remond** (Observer for the European Union) said that editing changes made to draft resolutions had aroused concern: some had been introduced at the last minute, causing unnecessary stress, and others had reopened substantial discussions regarding content. Agreed language was at times purposely vague. As the adoption of a number of draft resolutions had been postponed merely because of departures from cross-cutting language, a minimalist approach to editing draft resolutions should be adopted in future.

Agenda item 16: Information and communications technologies for development (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.15 and A/C.2/71/L.44)

Draft resolutions on information and communications technologies for development (A/C.2/71/L.15 and A/C.2/71/L.44)

3. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.44, submitted by Mr. Seoane (Peru), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.15.

4. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.44 had no programme budget implications.

5. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.44 was adopted.*

6. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.15 was withdrawn.*

Oral decision on the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Director General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on communication for development programmes in the United Nations system (A/71/307)

7. **The Chair** proposed that the Committee should take note of the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Director General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on communication for development programmes in the United Nations system, as contained in document A/71/307.

8. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.31 and A/C.2/71/L.54)

Draft resolutions on the promotion of international cooperation to combat illicit financial flows in order to foster sustainable development (A/C.2/71/L.31 and A/C.2/71/L.54)

9. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.54, submitted by Mr. Andambi (Kenya), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.31.

10. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

11. **Mr. Andambi** (Kenya), introducing an oral correction to the draft resolution, said that the fourth line of the eighth preambular paragraph should reflect agreed language. The phrase "engage with other States Members of the United Nations" should be replaced by "engage other United Nations Member States".

12. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.54, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

13. **Mr. Dolbow** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation firmly believed that combating money laundering, tax evasion and corruption was crucial for the achievement of sustainable development by all Member States. However, it was disappointing that the draft resolution diluted the attention paid to such important issues by raising them in an overly crowded Second Committee agenda when more relevant forums existed. Close collaboration with Vienna-based United Nations bodies, especially the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption, would be more fruitful than addressing highly technical matters in the Committee.

14. **Mr. Bolaji** (Nigeria) said that the adoption of the draft resolution marked a milestone for the Second Committee. Illicit financial flows reduced the resources and revenue needed to fund poverty eradication programmes, to provide basic infrastructure and to support education for young people. Combating illicit flows would require strong international cooperation and concerted efforts by developed and developing countries alike. He expressed the hope that the World Bank Group and other United Nations development entities would deploy their technical expertise to combat illicit financial flows and provide the necessary support to recover stolen assets,

converting them into instruments of sustainable development.

15. The report of the High Level Panel on Illicit Financial Flows from Africa used the umbrella term "illicit financial flows" to describe all cross-border movement of capital associated with illegal activities. While discussion was ongoing regarding the precise scope and definition of "illicit financial flows", all illegal activities were an impediment to development and should be condemned. His Government had taken steps to combat illicit financial flows headlong. All Member States should welcome the resolution as part of the global effort and strategy to achieve sustainable development.

16. Although his delegation looked forward to the report of the Inter-Agency Task Force on Financing for Development, it also believed that illicit financial flows should be the subject of a report of the Secretary-General.

17. **Ms. Saran** (South Africa) said that while official development assistance (ODA) remained crucial for developing countries, especially African countries, combating the illegal movement of African money was a major priority in efforts to achieve sustainable and inclusive growth on the continent. The scourge of illicit financial flows reduced the benefits that developing countries could derive from trade, especially in commodities, which was a driver for investment, economic growth and social development. Combating illicit financial flows, especially from Africa, must be at the forefront of international efforts related to development financing. Governments must encourage transparency by multinational corporations, discourage and detect cross-border tax evasion and curb trade mispricing and misinvoicing. Corruption played a minor role in illicit financial flows by comparison and should not be highlighted as the main problem.

18. In its Special Declaration on Illicit Financial Flows, the African Union Assembly had committed to ending illicit financial flows in Africa, ensuring that the revenues lost through illicit capital flight were identified and returned to achieve the continent's development objectives. However, as Africa continued to lose up to US$150 billion annually through illicit financial flows, international and intergovernmental cooperation would be critical.

19. She expressed concern that the Secretary-General would not be submitting a report on illicit financial flows during the seventy-second session of the General Assembly, and the hope that it would not become a practice. The report of the Secretary-General should not be seen as conflicting with the report of the Inter-Agency Task Force, as both had their own mandates. The United Nations must help to channel international efforts to combat illicit financial flows, with a view to allowing developing countries to reverse the trend and develop their own means of combating the scourge. As the international community should be making greater efforts to that end, she urged the Second Committee to continue to include illicit financial flows on its agenda.

20. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.31 was withdrawn.*

(a) International trade and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.29 and A/C.2/71/L.57)

Draft resolutions on international trade and development (A/C.2/71/L.29 and A/C.2/71/L.57)

21. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.57, submitted by Mr. Andami (Kenya), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.29. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

22. **Mr. Momeni** (Islamic Republic of Iran), facilitator, introducing an oral correction, said that in paragraph 11, "multilateral trade agreements" should be replaced by "plurilateral trade agreements". The paragraph should end with the phrase "consistent with the plurilateral trade agreements of the World Trade Organization". In paragraph 27, "of the World Trade Organization" should be deleted after "small economies" in the seventh line.

23. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.57, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

24. **Mr. Dolbow** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that the promotion of trade was an integral part of achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. While his delegation would not block consensus, it dissociated itself with paragraphs 9 and 12; for the United States, those paragraphs would not serve as precedent for any future negotiated documents. The resolution did not affect potential constraints under international law or agreements that applied to policy space, nor did it affect the rights of States to take trade measures. In paragraph 9, the decision to reference only the World Trade Organization (WTO) ministerial decision on public stockholding for food security purposes was flawed, as it omitted other equally important WTO decisions that also supported development, such as the ministerial decision on export competition. All WTO decisions were adopted by all WTO members; the choice of language in paragraph 9 thus seemed driven

by a political agenda, rather than genuine aspirations for development. With regard to paragraph 12, the right of WTO members to utilize flexibilities consistent with their WTO obligations did not vary according to their development status. His delegation rejected any interpretation of the paragraph that would implicitly value the rights of some WTO members over those of other members.

25. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.29 was withdrawn.*

(b) International financial system and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.30 and A/C.2/71/L.58)

Draft resolutions on the international financial system and development (A/C.2/71/L.30 and A/C.2/71/L.58)

26. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.58, submitted by Mr. Andambi (Kenya), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.30. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

27. **Mr. Abebe** (Ethiopia), facilitator, said that agreement had been reached on omitting references to countries living under foreign occupation. In addition, in the fourth line of the twelfth preambular paragraph, "as well as" should be changed to "including".

28. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.58, as orally revised, was adopted.*

29. **Mr. Singer** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that while his delegation had joined consensus, it wished to underscore that the resolution did not create or affect States' rights or obligations under international law. He noted with concern that the term "equitable" was used twice in the draft resolution. As the United States endorsed the importance of universal access to open and transparent markets, any unintended interpretation of the term "equitable" that implied a subjective assessment of fairness must be avoided in order to prevent unintended economic consequences.

30. With regard to paragraph 2, the reference to "equitable economic growth" lacked clarity and invited subjective assessment of whether policy decisions taken by institutions independent of the United Nations had to be altered. The long-standing position of his delegation was that because international monetary, financial and trade institutions operated independently of the United Nations, it was inappropriate for the resolutions of the General Assembly to opine on their operations.

31. With regard to paragraphs 4 and 5, his delegation had long promoted consensual, orderly, sovereign debt restructuring efforts within a framework of contractual certainty. In renegotiating contractual terms, both creditors and sovereign debtors must work cooperatively to negotiate a voluntary, consensual resolution; restructuring negotiations must take place within a framework where both sides could seek recourse to the courts to enforce contractual terms.

32. With regard to paragraph 12, the United States strongly disagreed that multilateral development banks should provide concessional financing for purposes of achieving the Sustainable Development Goals to all developing countries facing financing gaps. Concessional financing should go to those countries least able to finance their own development. His delegation also strongly disagreed with the encouragement to provide "flexible, fast-disbursing and front-loaded assistance" without regard to the financial sustainability of the institutions, the development impact and effect on poverty reduction of such assistance, as well as the absorption capacity of recipient countries, including the presence of an appropriate macroeconomic policy framework. Following that suggestion was not financially sustainable, and could moreover be read as encouraging multilateral development banks to refrain from adhering to the high social, environmental and fiduciary standards that were essential for achieving sustainable development. In order to be effective in promoting long-term development, support for multilateral development banks and other donors must alter the behaviours and environments causing underdevelopment in the first place.

33. The insertion of language on unilateral economic measures in paragraph 33 was regrettable. Targeted economic sanctions were sometimes a successful means of achieving foreign policy objectives. The United States had applied economic sanctions to promote the return to the rule of law, to ensure respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and to prevent threats to international security. His country was within its rights in using its trade and commercial policy as tools to achieve such objectives. Some of the major proponents of the draft resolution's language had also levied unilateral sanctions against other Member States. His delegation believed that targeted economic sanctions could be an appropriate, effective and legitimate alternative to the use of force. Sanctions levied by the United States were in compliance with international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

34. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.30 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(c) Disaster risk reduction (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.13 and A/C.2/71/L.39)

Draft resolutions entitled "Effective global response to address the impacts of the El Niño phenomenon" (A/C.2/71/L.13 and A/C.2/71/L.39)

35. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.39, submitted by Mr. Díaz de la Guardia (Spain), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.13. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

36. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.39 was adopted.*

37. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.13 was withdrawn.*

(f) Convention on Biological Diversity (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.7 and A/C.2/71/L.42)

Draft resolutions on the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its contribution to sustainable development (A/C.2/71/L.7 and A/C.2/71/L.42)

38. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.42, submitted by Mr. Díaz de la Guardia (Spain), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.7. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

39. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.42 was adopted.*

40. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.7 was withdrawn.*

(g) Report of the United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.5 and A/C.2/71/L.45)

Draft resolutions entitled "Report of the United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme" (A/C.2/71/L.5 and A/C.2/71/L.45)

41. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.45, submitted by Mr. Díaz de la Guardia (Spain), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.5. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

42. **Mr. Calvo Calvo** (Costa Rica), facilitator, said that the language in the tenth preambular paragraph must be corrected to reflect cross-cutting language. It should therefore read: "Welcoming the Paris Agreement and its early entry into force, encouraging all the parties to fully implement the Agreement, and parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change that have not yet done so to deposit their instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, where appropriate, as soon as possible".

43. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.45, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

44. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.5 was withdrawn.*

(h) Harmony with Nature (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.8 and A/C.2/71/L.50)

Draft resolutions entitled "Harmony with Nature" (A/C.2/71/L.8 and A/C.2/71/L.50)

45. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.50, submitted by Mr. Díaz de la Guardia (Spain), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.8. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

46. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.50 was adopted.*

47. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.8 was withdrawn.*

(i) Promotion of new and renewable sources of energy (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.11 and A/C.2/71/L.40)

Draft resolutions on ensuring access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all (A/C.2/71/L.11 and A/C.2/71/L.40)

48. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.40, submitted by Mr. Díaz de la Guardia (Spain), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.11. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

49. **Ms. Jurečko** (Slovenia), facilitator, said that the sixth preambular paragraph should be brought into line with the agreed cross-cutting reference to the Paris Agreement; accordingly, the phrase "parties to the Agreement" should be replaced by "its parties". In the twelfth preambular paragraph, "includes" should be replaced by "will include". In the thirteenth preambular paragraph, the comma after "Sustainable Energy for All" should be deleted and "have given strong momentum" should read "has given strong momentum". In paragraph 13, the comma after "dissemination" should be deleted and replaced by "and". Lastly, in paragraph 20, the phrase "and also calls for" should be deleted.

50. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.40, as orally revised, was adopted.*

51. **Ms. Engelbrecht Schadtler** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution on the basis of its traditional support for the Group of 77 and China. Nevertheless, as had been the case in relation to the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) entitled "The future we want" (A/RES/66/288), her delegation could not endorse the references in the draft resolution to the Secretary-General's Sustainable Energy for All initiative, which had been developed without a mandate from Member States and had not been the product of a process of consultations and approval by Member States. It failed to take account of Governments' negotiations on the matter, and it put forward strategies that would undermine the sovereignty of Member States and could lead to market distortions that could create barriers to trade in hydrocarbons and hydrocarbon products.

52. Her delegation also had reservations about the reference to "modern energy services", which implied the use of new technologies without the necessary evaluation of their application in a national context or of technology development priorities. Furthermore, as pointed out at the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, for the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, on the basis of its Constitution, the reference to the elimination of subsidies for fossil fuels was tantamount to intervention in States' public policies. Her delegation was also unable to accept the reference to low-carbon economies. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would not accept any kind of evaluation, monitoring, reporting or review of its national energy policies or measures that impinged on its national sovereignty. Furthermore, paragraph 12 of the draft resolution departed from and substantially modified the actions agreed under the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg Plan of Implementation).

53. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.11 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 21: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(b) International migration and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.25 and A/C.2/71/L.48)

Draft resolutions on international migration and development (A/C.2/71/L.25 and A/C.2/71/L.48)

54. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.48, submitted by Ms. Nipomici (Republic of Moldova), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.25.

55. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement in connection with draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.48 in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, said that, with regard to the requests contained in paragraphs 9, 34 and 35 of the draft resolution, it was understood that all issues related to the intergovernmental conference on international migration to be held in 2018 and the third High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development to be held in the first half of 2019, including the date, format, organization and scope, were yet to be determined. Accordingly, it was not yet possible to estimate the potential cost implications of the requirements for meetings and documentation. Once a decision had been taken on the modalities, format and organization of the meetings, the Secretary-General would submit information on the relevant costs in accordance with rule 153. The adoption of the draft resolution would thus not give rise to any financial implications under the current programme budget.

56. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.48 was adopted.*

57. **Mr. Singer** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that immigration had greatly enriched the United States and it was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution and to take part in discussions on global migration, both at the United Nations and elsewhere, including through the Global Forum on Migration and Development. His delegation looked forward to participating actively in the development of a new global compact for safe, orderly and regular migration for adoption in 2018 and in the third High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development in 2019. In joining the consensus, however, it wished to underscore that neither draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.48 nor any of the other draft resolutions adopted by the Second Committee would change, or necessarily reflect, the obligations of the United States or other States under treaty law or customary international law. With respect to paragraphs 15 and 17, he stressed his delegation's view that, in many Member States, private financial institutions, not government entities, determined remittance transfer prices.

58. While the United States remained firmly committed to upholding the human rights of all people and to combating racial discrimination, xenophobia, intolerance and bigotry, it wished to make clear its position on paragraph 26, which was intended to urge States to take measures to prevent violent hate crimes

or other criminal acts of hostility against migrants. That paragraph should not be misinterpreted in order to inhibit freedom to express policy views or even hateful, repugnant attitudes or philosophies; rather, it must be interpreted in the light of robust international legal protections for freedom of expression.

59. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.25 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 22: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(a) Follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.26 and A/C.2/71/L.52)

Draft resolutions on follow-up to the fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (A/C.2/71/L.26 and A/C.2/71/L.52*)

60. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.52*, submitted by Mr. Andambi (Kenya), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.26. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

61. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.52* was adopted.*

62. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.26 was withdrawn.*

Oral decision on the note by the Secretary-General on the Technology Bank for the Least Developed Countries (A/71/363)

63. **The Chair** proposed that the Committee should take note of the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the draft Charter of the Technology Bank for the Least Developed Countries (A/71/363).

64. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 23: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(b) Industrial development cooperation (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.22 and A/C.2/71/L.49)

Draft resolutions on industrial development cooperation (A/C.2/71/L.22 and A/C.2/71/L.49)

65. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.49, submitted by Ms. Nipomici (Republic of Moldova), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.22. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

66. **Ms. Daly** (Guyana), facilitator, said that the language in several paragraphs of the draft resolution contained in A/C.2/71/L.49 should revert to the language agreed in the consensus document. In particular, the thirteenth, fourteenth and sixteenth preambular paragraphs in A/C.2/71/L.49 should be replaced, respectively, by the thirteenth preambular paragraph, the thirteenth preambular paragraph bis and the fifteenth preambular paragraph in the consensus document. In addition, paragraphs 9, 19, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34 in A/C.2/71/L.49 should be replaced, respectively, by paragraphs 9, 19, 29 bis, 29 ter, 30, 31 and 32 in the consensus document.

67. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.49, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

68. **Mr. Singer** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that, while his delegation was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution, it wished to make clear its position with regard to the transfer of technology. It firmly considered that strong protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights provided critical incentives needed to produce innovation that would enable the world to address both current and future health, environment and development challenges. It understood that references in the draft resolution to the transfer of or access to technology referred to voluntary technology transfers on mutually agreed terms and conditions and that all references to access to information or knowledge meant information or knowledge that was made available with the authorization of the legitimate holder thereof. With regard to any references in the draft resolution to support for local and regional industrial development and value chains, his delegation wished to make it clear that such support must be consistent with States' international obligations, including their WTO commitments, and must not exacerbate the growing problem of global excess capacity.

69. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.22 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(c) Disaster risk reduction (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.9 and A/C.2/71/L.43)

Draft resolutions on disaster risk reduction (A/C.2/71/L.9 and A/C.2/71/L.43)

70. **The Chair** drew attention to draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.43, submitted by Mr. Díaz de la Guardia (Spain), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.9. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications. He took it that the Committee

wished to waive the relevant provision of rule 120 of the rules of procedure in order to consider the draft resolution at the current meeting

71. *It was so decided.*

72. **Mr. González-Valdivia** (Chile), facilitator, said that "where feasible" at the end of paragraph 9 should read "if feasible".

73. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.43, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

74. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.9 was withdrawn.*

(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.17 and A/C.2/71/L.51)

Draft resolutions on protection of the global climate for present and future generations of humankind (A/C.2/71/L.17 and A/C.2/71/L.51)

75. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.51, submitted by Mr. Díaz de la Guardia (Spain), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.17. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

76. **Ms. Burdloff** (France), co-facilitator, said that the reference in the third preambular paragraph to article 2 (2) of the Paris Agreement should read "article 2.2" in order to be consistent with the numbering format in the Agreement.

77. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.51, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

78. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.17 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 24: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(b) South-South cooperation for development (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.16 and A/C.2/71/L.61)

Draft resolutions on South-South cooperation for development (A/C.2/71/L.16 and A/C.2/71/L.61)

79. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.61, submitted by Mr. Seoane (Peru), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.16.

80. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement in connection with draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.61 in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, said that, with regard to the requests contained in paragraph 30, it was understood that all issues related to the high-level United Nations conference on South-South cooperation to be held in 2019, including the date, format, organization and scope, were yet to be determined. Accordingly, it was not yet possible to estimate the potential cost implications of the requirements for meetings and documentation. Once a decision was taken on the modalities, format and organization of the conference, the Secretary-General would submit information on the relevant costs, in accordance with rule 153. The adoption of the draft resolution would thus not give rise to any financial implications under the current programme budget.

81. **Mr. Larhmaid** (Morocco), co-facilitator, and **Mr. Konrád** (Czechia) drew attention to minor drafting changes in paragraphs 30 and 27, respectively.

82. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.61, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

83. **Mr. Singer** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that the United States had provided political and financial support for the good work of the United Nations in the area of South-South cooperation. It was in that context that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. At the same time, it wished to make clear its views concerning some recent developments in the Organization's South-South development work. It had come to light in 2015 that some individuals within and outside the United Nations had engaged in wrongdoing and illegal activities in connection with that work. Several investigations and an audit conducted by United Nations entities had revealed vulnerabilities in the way such work was carried out, including a lack of transparency and accountability and ill-defined reporting lines, rules and regulations governing the operations of key United Nations entities, including the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation and the United Nations High-level Committee on South-South Cooperation. While the Office had taken steps to implement the audit recommendations, some key recommendations remained outstanding, largely because they extended beyond the purview of any individual entity.

84. In order for any reform efforts to succeed, all parts of the United Nations involved in South-South cooperation would have to work together under the leadership of the Secretary-General to make some fundamental changes to the entire system. Accordingly, his delegation, working together with many others, was asking the Secretary-General to undertake a comprehensive review of the Organization's South-

South cooperation activities and to recommend specific reform measures to correct systemic weaknesses concerning the entities involved and their management practices. It requested the Secretary-General to conduct the review in consultation with the Office of Internal Oversight Services and the UNDP Office of Audit and Investigations; it also requested that he make successful implementation of reform measures a precondition for the provision of additional resources for United Nations South-South cooperation and consider the possibility of appointing a special representative for South-South cooperation.

85. With regard to paragraph 30 of the draft resolution, it was his delegation's understanding that the high-level United Nations conference on South-South cooperation to be held in Buenos Aires in 2019 would be funded entirely through extrabudgetary resources. With respect to the paragraphs in the resolution that dealt with the transfer of technology, his delegation reiterated its position, as stated earlier in relation to draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.49, concerning intellectual property rights, voluntary technology transfer and access to information and knowledge.

86. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.16 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.19/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on the implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (A/C.2/71/L.19/Rev.1)

87. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.19/Rev.1, submitted by Thailand on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. The draft resolution contained no budget implications.

88. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.19/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia, Canada, Iceland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey.

89. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.19/Rev.1 was adopted by 113 votes to 42, with 8 abstentions.*

90. **Ms. Zolcerová** (Slovakia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States and noting that those States had voted against the draft resolution, said that it was regrettable that consensus had not been reached on the text, despite the tremendous efforts of the parties that had taken part in the negotiations thereon. The European Union remained of the view that the annual consideration of a resolution on Agenda

21 was not justified. The resolutions on the matter had fulfilled their purpose, having helped to shape the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. While Agenda 21 had been a milestone in the journey towards sustainable development, yearly reminders of its importance were not needed. The United Nations should now focus its efforts on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. Indeed, continued yearly reviews of the implementation of Agenda 21 could divert valuable resources away from those efforts.

91. In a spirit of compromise, the States members of the European Union had been willing to consider a resolution to be submitted in 2019 during the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly, after the first full cycle of the high-level political forum on sustainable development. They considered that any report to be prepared by the Secretary-General on the issues mentioned in paragraph 14 of the text contained in A/C.2/71/L.19/Rev.1 would require more time than the amount allocated and therefore could not agree with the proposal submitted by the Group of 77 and China, which continued to mandate the consideration of both the Secretary-General's report and a sub-item on Agenda 21 during the seventy-second session. In an attempt to achieve compromise, the European Union member States had, despite reservations, agreed to the inclusion of a number of other paragraphs in the facilitator's text and had hoped that their fair-minded, pragmatic and logical approach would have been recognized. The rejection of that text by the Group of 77 and China was unfortunate.

92. The European Union had repeatedly shown flexibility on key issues and found it regrettable that, after years of constructive cooperation on the Agenda 21 resolutions, it had not been possible to adopt the current text without a vote. The European Union remained fully committed to engaging in constructive discussions with a view to modernizing and aligning the work of the Second Committee with the most recent high-level milestones on sustainable development. It sought to do so in a manner that was acceptable to all parties concerned, bearing in mind that the work of the Committee could be broader than the work relating to the 2030 Agenda.

93. **Ms. Loe** (Norway) said that lack of agreement on the last two paragraphs of the draft resolution had made it impossible to reach consensus on the text, and her delegation had therefore not been in a position to vote in favour of the version contained in A/C.2/71/L.19/Rev.1. It had decided to abstain for several reasons. The Agenda 21 resolution had been of vital importance in previous years, not least because it had helped to make operational a number of decisions taken at the Rio+20 conference. It had now fulfilled its purpose, however, and her delegation did not see the need to continuing revisiting the resolution on an annual basis, particularly in light of the need to focus time and resources on the most critical issues. Norway had been ready to agree, as a compromise, to revisit the Agenda 21 resolution in 2019, but that compromise had unfortunately not been accepted by all parties. With regard to the report requested in paragraph 14, her delegation was of the view that the Secretariat should focus its limited resources on follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development.

94. Her delegation had decided to abstain, rather than voting against the draft resolution, because of the flexibility shown on difficult issues during the informal consultations, which had, for the most part, been constructive and cordial. She wished to thank fellow negotiators and the facilitator. She also wished to assure the Committee that Norway remained fully committed to the implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development.

95. **Mr. Sekiguchi** (Japan) said that the Agenda 21 resolutions had fulfilled their purpose and the yearly consideration of such a resolution should be terminated. The 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda provided a comprehensive framework for safeguarding the planet while also eradicating poverty from the world, and the international community should now focus solely on their implementation. The Second Committee had a key role to play with respect to the historic agreements adopted in 2015; it must show that the States Members of the United Nations could stand together in implementing the new universal agenda. As to the draft resolution, his delegation could have supported the facilitator's text of 18 November, which had represented a good compromise among the differing views. It was grateful to the facilitator and to the coordinator for the Group of 77 and China for their constructive approach and their tremendous efforts to bring about consensus, and regretted that those efforts had not been successful.

96. **Mr. Singer** (United States of America) said that, although his delegation remained firmly committed to the promotion and achievement of sustainable development, it had been compelled to call a vote on the draft resolution and to vote against it because the resolution would not advance Member States' common objectives and indeed would undermine their collective ability to focus on the most pressing economic, social

and environmental challenges facing the world as a whole. As his delegation had emphasized during the failed discussions on revitalization of the work of the Second Committee earlier in the year, the Committee must remain a vital forum for meaningfully addressing global development priorities. It could not do so, however, if it expended its limited time and resources on resolutions that merely reiterated prior political commitments and previously agreed language. At the same time, his delegation greatly appreciated the efforts of the facilitator and the coordinator for the Group of 77 and China to find common ground and wished to stress that its vote did not reflect on their work but on the substance of the draft resolution.

97. The Agenda 21 resolutions had helped to advance international negotiations on sustainable development and had laid the foundation for the 2030 Agenda. However, they had served their purpose and there was no longer any credible reason to continue adopting such a resolution. The architecture for the follow-up and review of the Sustainable Development Goals had been established and the underlying framework was well accepted. Moreover, although some delegations appeared to wish to use the Agenda 21 resolution as a means of promoting a new global discussion on sustainable consumption and production, a framework already existed for that purpose: the 10-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns, which had been agreed after long and often contentious debates in the Commission on Sustainable Development and at the Rio+20 conference. His delegation strongly supported that framework and saw no benefit to encouraging duplicative discussions in the General Assembly.

98. **Mr. Cripton** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia and New Zealand, said that, although Canada, Australia and New Zealand had abstained from voting on the draft resolution, they did not support it and had profound concerns about the relevance of continuing to adopt a resolution on Agenda 21 in the Sustainable Development Goal era. They were also concerned about the attempt to position the Agenda 21 resolution as the General Assembly follow-up and review mechanism for the 2030 Agenda. Nevertheless, the delegations of the three countries wished to salute the heroic efforts by the facilitator and the lead negotiator for the Group of 77 and China, whose creativity, respectful discourse and patience had helped to resolve the vast majority of the difficulties that had prevented consensus from being reached.

99. The Second Committee risked sliding into irrelevance if its collective membership failed to engage in a critical examination of the roster of resolutions that made up its agenda, particularly in light of the historic adoption by the General Assembly of the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and other related outcomes. Canada, Australia and New Zealand remained willing and open to working with committed Members to ensure that the Second Committee focused on credible solutions to the most pressing challenges facing the international community.

100. **Ms. Pamaranon** (Thailand), making a general statement after the voting and speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that Member States had a responsibility to ensure that the work of the Second Committee remained relevant and met the objectives of the ambitious global agenda for poverty eradication and sustainable development, while also taking into account unfinished business and existing mechanisms and frameworks. It was regrettable that the main reason consensus had not been reached on the draft resolution had to do with its periodicity and with attempts to bring the General Assembly revitalization process into the substantive work of the Second Committee. At no point had the Group of 77 and China been presented with a clear, objective, evidence-based reason to change the periodicity of the resolution; the desire to do so seemed to emanate from what some would deem an unfavourable outcome to the revitalization discussions earlier in the year.

101. The Group of 77 and China had fulfilled its duty to submit the draft text on time and indeed had submitted it early. It was unfortunate that a facilitator for the resolution had not been assigned until nearly two weeks after its submission. The sponsors had tried repeatedly, but to no avail, to explain the value and relevance of the draft resolution and to point out the areas in which it could provide added value, including that of sustainable consumption and production and that of water and sanitation, two areas that had remained almost entirely unaddressed in the work of the General Assembly. The response they had received from developed partners had been interesting and revealing: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the high-level political forum should cover all aspects of previous sustainable development conferences.

102. The Group of 77 and China had done its utmost to be flexible, including by accepting the facilitator's text which did not include its proposals concerning a sub-item in the agenda for the seventy-second session of the Assembly and the submission of a report by the Secretary-General. The Group was deeply disappointed and worried by some partners' lack of support for the concept of sustainable consumption and production,

which had clear links to, and roots in, Agenda 21, the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation and the Rio+20 outcome document. They had sought to ensure that the issue was given adequate coverage in order to ensure that the 2030 Agenda as a whole received the necessary political support by the General Assembly. It was their hope that all Member States would engage in future negotiations with dedication and an open mind in order to leave no one behind.

103. **Ms. Arrieta Munguia** (Mexico), facilitator, expressing thanks to all delegations that had participated in a positive and flexible manner in the consultations on the draft resolution, said that her delegation saw the revitalization of the work of the Second Committee as a journey on which all members had decided to embark. Mexico affirmed its willingness to support and work constructively in that positive exercise.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.